

The following is a critical evaluation of the research paper '*Competing Perspectives on Rural Homelessness: Findings from a Qualitative Study in Ontario, Canada*' (Buck-Mcfadyen, 2021), with the aim to consider the value and robustness of the article in a systematic way. To achieve this there will be a critical evaluation of the philosophical concepts involved in the research and an analysis of the research methodology. A reflection will be made on the ethical frameworks which underpin the study. There will be a brief exploration of the literature review, to evaluate whether the research area is valid. During the pre-empirical Stage of the research design as suggested by Punch (2014, p. 5) the researcher identified that there is insufficient data in current literature on the scale of homelessness particularly within a rural context. They identified the gap in this knowledge and acknowledged that the majority of research undertaken previously, mainly focused on urban areas (Waegemakers Schiff *et al.* 2016). Pierson (2010, p. 154) acknowledges that there are specific constraints that are characteristics of a rural environment that contribute to social exclusion, such as limited infrastructure and access to services, alongside a shortfall in affordable housing. The researcher then used an inductive approach to analyse the emerging themes from semi structured interviews. There will be a discussion on how the data was gathered and approaches used. The emerging themes and results will be cross referenced with other studies of the same nature to evaluate the validity of the findings. Ethical considerations such as confidentiality, power inequalities and legal frameworks will be identified. To conclude there will be a discussion on the findings and an exploration of the initiatives such as Anti-Stigma programmes and whether such initiatives are feasible in a rural environment.

Kauppi *et al.* (2017) suggested that to begin with, there is a gap in knowledge with regards to defining 'homelessness and yet a straightforward and practical definition is essential to research this complex issue. The Canadian Observatory on Homelessness (2016) defined homelessness as:

'The situation of an individual or family without stable, permanent, appropriate housing or the immediate prospect, means and ability of acquiring it'.

For the purpose of this study the researcher used four main categories of homelessness identified by the Canadian Observatory on Homelessness (2012) which included Absolute and At Risk. The European Observatory on Homelessness described thirteen categories which included housing standards such as hot and cold running water, size and affordability (Amore *et al.* 2011), this illustrates just how complex this social phenomenon is and how difficult it is therefore to define and record statistically. The author introduces the research area with quantitative data from the Canadian Observatory of Homelessness and states that Canada is in a housing crisis, with an estimated 235,000 Canadians experiencing homelessness each year (Gaetz *et al.* 2016). This statement is validated as the National Housing Strategy Canada stated that 1.7 million Canadians are in housing need and 25,000 homeless on any given night (MacLennan *et al.* 2019, pp. 23). Figures from Shelter England stated that 354,000 people in England included in this figure 161,500 children, will have spent Christmas 2024 without a home (Shelter England, 2024). There is an important factor to consider in the quantitative data available with specific regard

to homelessness in a rural context, homelessness is 'hidden'. The Canadian Observatory on Homelessness (2012), stated, if you then take into account the numbers of the 'Hidden Homeless' there would be a three-fold increase in these figures. From the data available both in Canada and the UK it could be suggested that the research area is valid and that there is a housing crisis both in Canada as the study suggests and in England.

Research on the numbers and causes of homelessness is limited and has only really begun in the last two decades (Rodrique, 2016). Much of the previous research undertaken with regards to homelessness has been conducted in an urban setting (Waegemkers Schiff *et al.* 2016). The nature of people experiencing homelessness in a rural community differs from an urban setting as people often hide their situation from others and do not approach service providers, this complicates the quantitative data gathered in this field (Macdonald *et al.* 2019). Kauppi *et al.* (2017) suggested that this is an underrepresented subgroup who are socioeconomically disadvantaged. This paper correctly identifies there is a gap in this knowledge and has used participants from Ontario Canada, a rural geographical area. Statistics Canada (2006) states that rurality consists of villages and places of less than 10,000 inhabitants.

It has been suggested that experiences of housing insecurity and homelessness have been on the increase since the 1990's (Gaetz *et al.* 2016). This increase could be due to the combination of multiple factors such as low income, the lack of affordable housing, decreasing stocks in social housing and a reduction in benefit allowances (Pierson, 2010; Gaetz *et al.* 2016; MacDonald *et al.* 2019). Others would include childhood trauma and also individuals and families who move around a lot. (Rodrigue, 2016). These factors are commonly attributed to the increased risk of homelessness but are intensified in a rural environment (Pierson, 2010).

Stigma associated with housing insecurity is a challenge individuals and families face that is intensified within a rural community (Kauppi *et al.* 2017; Buck-McFadyen, 2021). Literature available suggests that stigma is a significant barrier to obtaining employment and housing and has also been connected to having an effect on a person's physical and mental health (Reilly *et al.* 2022). This is also acknowledged by Edwards *et al.* (2009) who stated people in rural communities often hid their homelessness from others due to fear of judgement and disapproval. In a small rural community it is easier for individual challenges to become public knowledge, this creates a barrier for those individuals to secure employment and housing within that community (Forchuk *et al.* 2010). The study's overall aim is trying to bring the invisible nature of rural homelessness into the domain by attempting to understand the lived experiences of people identifying as housing insecure in a rural community, addressing this gap in knowledge by giving these people a voice.

To empower the individuals taking part in the study the methodology the researcher used was a qualitative, exploratory approach using interpretive description to analyse the findings. Up until the middle of the 20th Century quantitative research methodology dominated the research domain (Cresswell, 2018.) During the latter half of the 20th Century a qualitative methodology was emerging (Denscombe, 2010). This approach was used for exploring and understanding the meaning individuals give to their own experiences. The processes of this type of research usually involve emerging questions in the participants own

setting and is an inductive style of research (Thorne *et al.* 2004). Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggested that individuals develop subjective meanings of their own experiences and that a qualitative researcher will look for the complexity in views (Cresswell, 2018). As the researcher identified the gap in knowledge surrounding the specific barriers those in rural communities face, and aimed to get perspectives from those with lived experiences of homelessness the qualitative, inductive approach is viable and the researcher was accurate in identifying this methodology as the issue of homelessness has many layers and therefore can not be measured effectively using quantitative methodology.

It could be suggested that the researcher in this study held a transformative world view (Cresswell, 2018). This paradigm emerged in the 1980's and takes the perspective that the traditional positivist view that all phenomena can be measured using scientific instruments and validated with quantitative data did not fit in with marginalised groups of society such as people experiencing homelessness. and neither takes into consideration issues of power, justice, discrimination and oppression (Nudzor, 2009). The fact that the researcher chose this particular field of study could illustrate their own ontology and epistemology (Cresswell, 2013). The researcher in this study is embracing the idea of multiple realities as the title suggests the study's focus is on competing perspectives so this approach is in line with the research proposal. It could be suggested that the framework that underpinned this study and approach was research problem centered rather than centred around a specific question or hypothesis (Punch, 2013). The interpretive description used to analyse the findings is in line with the studies epistemology that realities are local, specific and constructed (Thorne *et al.* 2004). Critical theory incorporates idiographic explanation, that is the understanding of the uniqueness of an individual case (Bell *et al.* 2024). By using an inductive approach the researcher acknowledges the constructed and contextual nature of human experience while at the same time allowing for shared realities (Thorne *et al.* 2004, Bell *et al.* 2024). The foundations to this approach is a small sample using qualitative methods such as interviews to capture unique themes emerging.

The study used semi structured interviews conducted with individuals that self-identified as housing insecure as well as key informants (KI) who had knowledge of the local homelessness situation. Interview questions focused on the experience and impact of housing insecurity, what they believed contributed, how the rural setting influenced this and potential solutions. The researcher used word of mouth, snowball sampling and flyers that were distributed at local service provider outlets such as food banks. The majority of the interviews were held in the boardroom of a charitable organisation and lasted between 15 and 90 minutes long. There were 27 participants involved, 16 individuals that self-identified as housing insecure and 11 KI. Among the sample those who self identified as housing insecure, 8 were unsheltered and 8 were provisionally housed.

The size of the sample in this study would appear reasonably small; it could be suggested there was a need for further inquiry on the methods used to attract participants. The flyers that advertised for participants were placed in the offices of non-profit service providers. Edwards *et al.* (2009) acknowledge one aspect of rural homelessness is that it remains 'hidden' as people hide their situations from their local communities. This sub-group does not typically approach service providers (Kauppi *et al.* 2017) so may not have been represented by this study's findings and again illustrates how difficult it is to reach out to these individuals and gather enough data to have an impact on policy and practice. All of the

studies participants were known by the police and the community leaders. This could also have been a limitation as it reduces anonymity. The study was initially designed to include focus groups but due to COVID restrictions at the time of the study, this part of the research design had to be amended. A section of the interviews commenced in the setting of a boardroom in a service providers establishment; this could also have had an impact on participants' responses as this is not a usual environment for them. It is a duty of social researchers to think ahead to see any forms of possible distress that could impact the involvement of the participant such as the physical setting (Denscombe, 2010). In a reflective inquiry conducted by Ecker, (2017) it was revealed that the choice of location for homeless and vulnerable people is a consideration when designing social research, and suggests that the aim of the researcher would be to present the participants in their true identities, capturing their attitudes as well as an understanding of their living situation. This critical evaluation takes into account possible safeguarding concerns when interviewing vulnerable individuals in their own setting.

Analysis of the results did reveal varying perspectives. All participants recognised that there was a significant problem with housing availability and all acknowledged an unacceptable number of people experiencing homelessness, but none agreed on the actual scale of the problem. One participant who was provisionally housed stated that they thought they knew of at least forty others in the same situation as themselves (Buck-McFadyen, 2021). This discrepancy in the scale of the issue could in part be down to the actual reported numbers and the 'hidden' factor. The majority of the statistical information available are of those that are 'publicly visible' and absolute, not taking into consideration the hidden homeless and all those living in substandard accommodation (Amore *et al.* 2011). A universal definition may help to increase understanding and recognition of the challenges individuals and families face when experiencing rural homelessness; this could also contribute to raising this group's visibility. Brighenti (2010) suggests that visibility confers a sense of power and is closely associated with recognition. The lack of recognition is also connected to the denial of homelessness in rural communities (Edwards *et al.* 2009), closely associated with 'stigma', which was described in the study as a contributing factor which led to the individual 'intentional' denial of the situation (Buck-McFadyen, 2021). Few people like to define themselves as homeless because that 'label' produces shame and stigma (Macdonald *et al.* 2019). People will go to great lengths to hide their situation particularly in a rural community to avoid this stereotyping. Many individuals' perception is that they are 'simply down on their luck' going through a transitional period. This lack of identifying their true situation could be another reason for not approaching service providers. They feel they are not in 'need'.

Along with the differences in view with regards to the scale of the issue, another competing perspective that emerged was in connection with the root causes of homelessness, ranging from a focus on individual choice to a structural systems failure. Canada is divided into provinces. Each province has its own legislation, regulations and policies (Falvo, 2017), adding to the complexity of the system. In the 1990's the federal government in Canada terminated the social housing supply programme and transferred all the social housing stock to the individual provinces. Few of the provinces remained active in housing provision (MacLennan *et al.* 2019). With a governmental move from a welfare

oriented policy to a market oriented policy with regards to housing, this meant that housing policy focused on ownership. Private developers were outbidding social landlords on real estate so market provision became difficult and as a consequence there is a decline in the availability of social units for rent (Falvo, 2017).

There was a similar shift in the UK. The UK government introduced the 'right to buy' policy enacted by the Housing Act (1980). There was no obligation within the act for the local authorities to use the capital they gained from the sales for constructing new homes (Eardley, 2022). Between the years 1949 and 1980 over five million social housing units were built, in the five years prior to the act 627,830 houses were built, in the five years following the act this number decreased to just 215,580 (Eardley, 2022). The Chartered Institute of Housing UK review (2021) recorded that the Treasury made £47 billion in revenue since the introduction of the policy. This suggests that the research findings were validated and that there is a link between affordable, available housing, government structures and policies and homelessness. Research indicates this is a challenge people in rural communities experience, participants also stated that income received from the government in the form of social assistance was also inadequate and a factor in keeping people in poverty, contributing to homelessness (Falvo, 2017).

Interventions were discussed in the research paper one being Anti-Stigma Education. Reilly *et al.* (2021) suggested that the stigma associated with homelessness had a direct impact on the individuals physical and mental wellbeing. Roa *et al.* (2019), suggests this approach needs to target several layers such as on an individual, interpersonal, community and structural level. Individual involves internalised stigma, the negative beliefs a person holds about themselves as a result of having a stigmatised status (Reilly *et al.* 2021). Interventions based on this level involve strategies such as counselling and self help groups. As the findings of the study suggested, people facing homelessness in rural communities do not necessarily have access to these services nor may they wish to approach service providers for help. Another challenge facing Anti-Stigma Education is at the structural level as it relies on governmental policies. If there is insufficient data to begin with on the scale of the problem, governments will not be eager to invest time and resources in these policies.

Cross Sector Collaboration was also mentioned as a strategy to combat rural homelessness. This is a policy trend where non-profit organisations and government sectors work together to address issues such as homelessness that cannot be solved by one sector alone (Mosley, 2021). Mosley (2021) describes three challenges to collaboratively working such as lack of capacity, inability to create momentum and inequality across service providers. As discussed earlier, rural communities have unique dynamics, variations in size and proximity to urban areas where service provision is more adequate (Waegemakers Schiff *et al.* 2016). These unique systems result in challenges to collaboration. Collaboration requires resources and time and can be perceived by service users as taking away from 'front line' provision (Mosley, 2021). The unique dynamics of each rural community pose challenges for another initiative 'Housing First'. This is founded on supplying supported housing to those most in need. The initiative can only be successful by a wrap-around approach so that the individual placed in this housing also has access to therapy, health services, addiction clinics and support to maintain their accommodation (Johnsen, 2013). In many rural areas the support services required to make this initiative successful are limited.

With all research there are ethical implications to consider. Social researchers are expected to conduct their research in an ethical manner which means they have to protect the interests of the participants (Denscome, 2010). Many governing bodies will have an ethics committee who are gatekeepers and it is their duty to consider all possible sources of harm (Bell *et al.* 2024). The study being evaluated was approved by the Research Ethics Board at Trent University. As the interviews were conducted back to back on a drop in basis, it could be suggested that anonymity could be a concern in this study. This is a guarantee that the participant will not be identified. One of the issues raised in previous studies on rural homelessness was the stigma and judgements placed on individuals due to the current challenges they are facing by other rural community members, and how this in turn affects their prospects of securing employment or housing (Kauppi *et al.* 2017). This critical evaluation questions how the research overcame this particular ethical consideration. As all the participants self-identifying as housing insecure were known to the police and community leaders this also brings into question considerations of anonymity and just how far was this an influence in who participated and what was said? Written consent was obtained and a demographic form completed. The participants were rewarded with \$20 at the beginning of the interviews. The incentive of cash could be seen as a subtle means of persuasion, representing inequality, this is important as it would have lessened the 'power relationship' between the researcher and participants (Cresswell, 2013).

The researcher correctly identified that there is a gap in knowledge with regards to homelessness within a rural context (Waegemakers Schiff *et al.* 2016). The data available is complicated by the hidden nature of the phenomenon (Edwards *et al.* 2009). From perspectives gained from the interviews conducted, one cause that emerged was the stigma surrounding individuals and families in their rural community and their unwillingness to approach service providers or even identify as facing homelessness themselves (Buck-McFadyen, 2021). Exploring the existing literature surrounding rural homelessness the study is validated with other authors also suggesting that homelessness is on the rise and countries such as Canada and England are indeed in a housing crisis (Gaetz *et al.* 2016; MacLennan *et al.* 2019; Shelter England, 2024). The literature also includes rural specific factors that contribute to homelessness, such as its hidden nature (MacDonald *et al.* 2019). The changing dynamics of the countryside with regards to employment levels, wages, availability and affordability of housing has also been acknowledged (Pierson, 2010; Waegemakers Schiff *et al.* 2016). The approach the researcher used, qualitative exploratory, was appropriate as the studies aim is to gain perspectives so this approach was used to explore the meanings people gave to their experiences of homelessness (Nudzor, 2009; Cresswell, 2018; Thorne *et al.* 2004). The data that emerged from the qualitative interviews validated by other studies done in the field, did reveal varying perspectives and illustrated that structural barriers such as government policies are a contributing factor in rural homelessness. The findings of this study did not create brand new knowledge but did extend the existing knowledge and literature available on different perspectives with regards to homelessness. The study also built on the existing literature on stigma as a barrier and the role small town dynamics play such as lack of privacy and poor service provision. Interventions suggested in the study on further research would be very challenging to implement and collaborate in regards to rural communities (Johnsen, 2013). It would appear

to achieve a holistic wrap-around approach that would involve precious time and resources. With government policy surrounding social housing inadequate and focusing on ownership it is unlikely that revenue will be made available to assist in collaborative working and other initiatives of this nature. The researcher only offered one definition of homelessness if this was developed to include various other categories such as those from the European Observatory on Homelessness; this could deepen the reader's understanding of this multilayer issue. As the researcher chose to conduct some of the interviews face to face this tried to minimise the distance between the researcher and the participants (Denscombe, 2010). Although the setting of a board room in a non-profit organisation may not have been the most appropriate choice given the participants the study is trying to engage with. On reflection, safeguarding concerns would have been a concern with regards to the vulnerability of the participants; there would have been an element of safety conducting the interviews in this setting.

Without the trust and good will of the public large parts of social research will become starved of information (Denscombe, 2010). The critical evaluation concludes that the study was appropriate, it has given people identifying a housing insecure a voice and an opportunity to participate. The researcher took ethical principles into consideration when conducting this study and the information retrieved has contributed to this particular field of social research.

Reference List

Amore, K., Baker, M., and Howden-Chapman, P. (2011) 'The ETHOS Definition and Classification of Homelessness: An Analysis', *European Journal of Homelessness*, 5(2), pp. 19-37. Available at: <https://www.feantsaresearch.org/download/article-1-33278065727831823087.pdf> (Accessed: 30 March 2025).

Bell, J., Waters, S., and Johnson, H. (2024) *Doing Your Research Project*. 8th edn. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Brighenti, A. (2017) 'The Visible: Element of the Social'. *Social and Urban Theory*, 2. Available at: <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/sociology/articles/10.3389/fsoc.2017.00017/full> (Accessed: 19 April 2025).

Buck-McFadyen, E. (2021) 'Competing Perspectives on Rural Homelessness: Findings from a Qualitative Study in Ontario Canada', *Health and Social Care Community*, pp. 1-9. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/hsc.13633>

Canadian Observatory on Homelessness. (2012). Canadian Definition of Homelessness. The Homeless Hub.

Cresswell, J. (2013) *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches*. 3rd edn. Los Angeles: Sage.

Cresswell, J., and Cresswell, D. (2018) *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches*. 5th edn. Los Angeles: Sage.

Denscombe, M. (2010) *Ground Rules for Social Research Guidelines for Good Practice*. 2nd edn. Berkshire: Open University Press.

Eardley, F. (2022) *Right to Buy: Past, Present and Future*. (House of Lords Library). Available at: <https://lordslibrary.parliament.uk/right-to-buy-past-present-and-future/> (Accessed: 12 April 2025).

Ecker, J. (2017) 'A Reflective Inquiry on the Effect of Place on Research Interviews Conducted with Homeless and Vulnerably Housed Individuals', *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 18(1), pp. 1-20. Available at: <https://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/2706/4050> (Accessed: 06 April 2025).

Edwards, M., Torgerson, M., and Sattem, J. (2009) 'Paradoxes of Providing Rural Services: The Case of Homeless Youth', *Rural Sociology*, 4(3), pp. 330-355. Available at: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1526/003601109789037204> (Accessed: 30 March 2025).

Falvo, N. (2017) *Ten Things to Know about Social Assistance in Canada*. Available at: <https://homelesshub.ca/blog/2017/ten-things-know-about-social-assistance-canada/> (Accessed: 19 April 2025).

Forchuk, C., Montgomery, P., Berman, H., Ward-Griffin, C., Csiernik, R., Gorlick, C., Jensen, E., and Riesterer, P. (2010) 'Gaining Ground Losing Ground: The Paradoxes of Rural Homelessness', *Canadian Journal of Nursing Research*, 42(2), pp. 138-152.

Gaetz, S., Dej, E., Richter, T., and Redman, M. (2016) *The State of Homelessness in Canada 2016*, Canadian Observatory on Homelessness research paper #12. Available at: https://www.homelesshub.ca/sites/default/files/attachments/SOHC16_ExecSummary_final_20Oct2016.pdf (Accessed: 30 March 2025).

Johnsen, S. (2013) 'Turning Point Scotland's Housing First Project Evaluation: Final Report', *Institute for Housing*. Available at: https://pure.hw.ac.uk/ws/portalfiles/portal/5945730/TPS_Housing_First_Final_Report.pdf (Accessed: 8 April 2025).

Kauppi, C., O'Grady, B., Schiff, R., Martin, F., and Ontario Municipal Social Services Association. (2017) 'Homelessness and Hidden Homelessness in Rural and Northern Ontario', *Rural Ontario Institute*. Available at: <https://www.ruralontarioinstitute.ca/file.aspx?id=ae34c456-6c9f-4c95-9888-1d9e1a81ae9a> (Accessed: 01 April 2025).

MacDonald, S.-A., and Gaulin, D. (2019) 'The Invisibility of Rural Homelessness in a Canadian Context', *Journal of Social Distress and Homelessness*, 29(2), pp. 169-183. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10530789.2019.1688540> (Accessed: 01 April 2025).

MacLennan, D., Pawson, H., Gibb, K., Chisholm, S., and Hulchanski, D. (2019) '*Shaping Futures Changing the Housing Story*', University of Sydney, University of Glasgow, University of Toronto Final Report 2019. Available at: <http://neighbourhoodchange.ca/documents/2019/11/canadas-housing-story-2019-chap-4.pdf> (Accessed: 16 April 2025).

Mosley, J. E. (2021) 'Cross-sector Collaboration to Improve Homeless Services: Addressing Capacity, Innovation, and Equity Challenges', *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 693(1), 246-263. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716221994464>

Nudzor, H. (2009) 'A Critical Commentary on Combined Methods Approach to Researching Educational and Social Issues', *Issues in Educational Research*, 19(2), pp. 114-127. Available at: <https://ir.ucc.edu.gh/xmlui/handle/123456789/8996> (Accessed: 30.03.2025).

Pierson, J. (2010) *Tackling Social Exclusion*. 2nd edn. Oxon: Routledge.

Punch, K. (2014) *Introduction to Social Research Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. 3rd edn. London: Sage.

Rao, D., Elshafei, A., Nguyen, M., Hatzenbuehler, M., Frey, S., and Go, V. (2019) 'A Systematic Review of Multi-Level Stigma Interventions: State of the Science and Future Directions', *BMC Medicine*, Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-018-1244-y> (Accessed: 12 April 2025).

Reilly, J., Ho, I., and Williamson, A. (2022) 'A Systematic Review of the Effect of Stigma on the Health of People Experiencing Homelessness', *Health and Social care in the Community*, 30, pp. 2128-2141. Available at: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/hsc.13884> (Accessed: 12 April 2025).

Rodrique, S. (2016) 'Hidden Homelessness in Canada', *Statistics Canada*. Available at: https://epe.bac-lac.gc.ca/100/201/301/weekly_acquisitions_list-ef/2016/16-47/publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2016/statcan/75-006-x/75-006-2016-12-eng.pdf (Accessed: 01 April 2025).

Shelter England (2024). *At Least 354,000 People Homeless in England Today* (2024)

Available at:

https://england.shelter.org.uk/media/press_release/at_least_354000_people_homeless_in_england_today (Assessed: 08 April 2025).

Thorne, S., Reimer Kirkham, S., and O'Flynn-Magee, K. (2004) 'The Analytic Challenge in Interpretive Description', *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 3(1), pp. 1-11.

Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/160940690400300101> (Accessed: 30 March 2025).

Waegemakers Schiff, J., Schiff, R., and Turner, A. (2016) 'Rural Homelessness in Western Canada: Lessons Learned from Diverse Communities', *Social Inclusion*, 4(4), pp. 73-85.

Available at: <https://doi.org/10.17645/si.v4i4.633> (Assessed: 30 March 2025).